

**REMARKS AND STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Claims 4-10, all the claims pending in the Office Action, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and claims 4-9 are rejected on prior art grounds. The Examiner indicates that claim 10 is objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim.

Applicants incorporate herein by reference the arguments set forth in the Amendment filed May 4, 2009 with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the prior art rejections.

Additionally, Applicants note that, in the Advisory Action dated May 12, 2009, the Examiner indicates that the Amendment filed May 4, 2009 was not entered because the amendments to the claims: 1) raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by the Examiner, and 2) present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejection claims. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the amendments to claims 4 and 6 would require further consideration and/or search (See Page 2 of Advisory Action).

Initially, Applicants note that item 2 appears to be an error by the Examiner since no new claims were added in the Amendment filed May 4, 2009. Additionally, Applicants note that the amendments to claims 4 and 6 were made to correct clerical errors and for precision of language. As these claim amendments merely place the application in better condition for appeal, Applicants submit that such claim amendments do not require further consideration and/or search by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of the Amendment filed May 4, 2009 on appeal.

On May 19, 2009, Applicants' representative, Sean M. Conner, conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Jue Zhang. During the interview, the Applicants' representative submitted that the claim amendments made in the Amendment filed May 4, 2009 should be entered on appeal for at least the above reasons.

The Examiner appeared to understand Applicants' position and indicated that, in response to the present Response, he will either: 1) issue a new Advisory Action indicating that the Amendment filed May 4, 2009 are entered and the arguments set forth therein are considered, 2) issue a new Office Action, or 3) issue a Notice of Allowance.

No exhibits or demonstrations were provided and no amendments were proposed by Applicants' representative. It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean M. Conner/

Sean M. Conner  
Registration No. 60,840

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 29, 2009